



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/667,650

09/22/2003

John Phenix

14846-23

1133

7590

07/05/2006

Michael B. Johannesen, Esq.
Lowenstein Sandler, P.C.
65 Livingston Avenue
Roseland, NJ 07068

EXAMINER

RAYYAN, SUSAN F

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2167

DATE MAILED: 07/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/667,650

Applicant(s)

PHENIX ET AL.

Examiner

Susan F. Rayyan

Art Unit

2167

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 September 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 09222003.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-16 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on September 22, 2003 was filed before First Office Action. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to because in Figures 6-12, the text in each figure is too small to read. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the

examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-6,9-10,13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over us Patent Number 5,893,108 issued to Venkatachary Srinivasan et al ("Srinivasan") and Stephen R. Davis ("Davis") Learn Java Now, Microsoft Press, 1996.

As per independent claim 1 Srinivasan teaches a method for representing a relational database table as a object in an object-oriented operating system (see Abstract) comprising:

providing a reference to a primary key having a one-to-one mapping to a table entry in said relational database (column 3, lines 52-53 and column 3, lines 64-65);

... the load method in the object-oriented operating system to load a latest instance of a table entry (column 3, lines 64-65 column 4, lines 3-6, column 11, lines 20-35); and ... a save method in the object-oriented operating system to save an instance of a table entry (column 4, lines 4-5).

Srinivasan does not explicitly teach overloading. Davis does teach overloading (p.49-50) to allow sets of methods with similar purpose to be given the same name (page 50, lines 4-5). It would have been obvious to modify Srinivasan with overloading to allow sets of methods with similar purpose to be given the same name (page 50, lines 4-5).

As per claim 2, same as claim arguments above and Srinivasan teaches: overloading a remove method in the object-oriented operating system to remove an instance of a table entry (column 11, lines 7-43).

As per claim 3, same as claim arguments above and Srinivasan teaches:

wherein overloading a remove method in the object-oriented operating system removes itself and any child instances (column 11, lines 7-67).

As per claim 4, same as claim arguments above and Srinivasan teaches:
wherein overloading a load method in the object-oriented operating system loads itself
and any child instances (column 11, lines 7-43).

As per claim 5, same as claim arguments above and Srinivasan teaches:
wherein overloading a save method in the object-oriented operating system saves itself
and any child instances (column 11, lines 7-43).

As per claim 6 , same as claim arguments above and Srinivasan teaches:
defining meta data relationship classes to define the relationship between a database
type and its equivalent object-oriented data type (column 11, lines 23-26).

As per claim 9, same as claim arguments above and Srinivasan teaches:
providing a read type converter reference to convert data types from relational database
data types to object-oriented data types (column 2, line 62 to column 3, line 8 ,column
11, lines 23-6, and Figure 1).

As per claim 10, same as claim arguments above and Srinivasan teaches:
providing a value added write data reference to convert data from relational database
data to object-oriented data (column 3, lines 64-65 and column 5, lines 4-6).

As per claim 13, same as claim arguments above and Srinivasan teaches:
automatically generating Java code from DDL (column 8, lines 59-61).

Claims 7-8,11-12,15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over us Patent Number 5,893,108 issued to Venkatachary Srinivasan et al ("Srinivasan") and Stephen R. Davis ("Davis") Learn Java Now , Microsoft Press, 1996 in view of US Patent Number 5,937,409 issued to Johnathan Wetherbee ("Wetherbee").

As per claim 7, same as claim arguments above and Srinivasan and Davis do not explicitly teach providing a read data reference to convert data types from object-oriented data types to relational database data types. Wetherbee does teach reference to convert data types from object-oriented data types to relational database data types (column 4, lines 42-64) to create from a relational database full fledged objects in an object oriented system (column 3, lines 36-41). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Srinivasan and Davis with automatically generating Java code from a data source to create from a relational database full-fledged objects in an object oriented system (column 3, lines 36-41).

As per claim 8, same as claim arguments above and Srinivasan and Davis do not explicitly teach providing a write data reference to map data from object-oriented data to relational database data. Wetherbee does teach providing a write data reference to map data from object-oriented data to relational database data (column 4, lines 42-64) to

Art Unit: 2167

create from a relational database full-fledged objects in an object-oriented system (column 3, lines 36-41). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Srinivasan and Davis with automatically generating Java code from a data source to create from a relational database full-fledged objects in an object oriented system (column 3, lines 36-41).

As per claim 11, same as claim arguments above and Srinivasan and Davis do not explicitly teach automatically generating Java code from a data source. Wetherbee does teach automatically generating Java code from a data source (column 3, lines 9-15 and 28-30) to create from a relational database full-fledged objects in an object-oriented system (column 3, lines 36-41). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Srinivasan and Davis with automatically generating Java code from a data source to create from a relational database full-fledged objects in an object oriented system (column 3, lines 36-41).

As per claim 12, same as claim arguments above and Srinivasan and Davis do not explicitly teach automatically generating Java code from database meta data. Wetherbee does teach automatically generating Java code from database meta data (column 5, lines 110-21) to create from a relational database full-fledged objects in an object oriented system (column 3, lines 36-41). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Srinivasan and Davis with

automatically generating Java code from database meta data to create from a relational database full fledged objects in an object oriented system (column 3, lines 36-41).

As per claim 15, same as claim arguments above and Srinivasan and Davis do not explicitly teach wherein generated code is independent of a specific J2EE technology, database, external service and third-party products. Wetherbee does teach generated code is independent of a specific J2EE technology, database, external service and third-party products (column 6, lines 8-17) to create from a relational database full-fledged objects in an object oriented system (column 3, lines 36-41). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Srinivasan and Davis with automatically generating Java code from database meta data to create from a relational database full fledged objects in an object oriented system (column 3, lines 36-41).

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over us Patent Number 5,893,108 issued to Venkatachary Srinivasan et al (“Srinivasan”) and Stephen R. Davis (“Davis”) Learn Java Now , Microsoft Press, 1996 in view of US Patent Number 5,918,225 issued to Peter W. Wise (“Wise”).

As per claim 14, same as claim arguments above and Srinivasan and Davis do not explicitly teach allowing vendor-specific SQL hints to be added to generated code to improve performance. White does teach allowing vendor-specific SQL hints to be added to generated code to improve performance (column 50, lines 36-47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify

Srinivasan and Davis with vendor-specific SQL hints to allow the system to avoid potentially time-consuming or incorrect assumptions (column 50, lines 43-45).

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over us Patent Number 5,893,108 issued to Venkatachary Srinivasan et al (“Srinivasan”) and Stephen R. Davis (“Davis”) Learn Java Now , Microsoft Press, 1996 in view of US Patent Number 6,529,913 issued to Robert C. Doig et al (“Doig”).

As per claim 16, same as claim arguments above and Srinivasan and Davis do not explicitly teach allowing incremental loading. Doig does teach allowing incremental loading (column 17, lines 17-32) to provide substantial saving in memory needed (column 17, lines 20-21). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Srinivasan and Davis with incremental loading to provide substantial saving in memory needed (column 17, lines 20-21).

Contact Information


5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan Rayyan whose telephone number is (571) 272-1675. The examiner can normally be reached M-F: 8am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on (571) 272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Susan Rayyan

June 7, 2006


JOHN R. COTTINGHAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER